



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,497	11/09/2001	Cecile Drogou	1974.PKG	3378

7590 03/01/2005

Cynthia L. Foulke
NATIONAL STARCH AND CHEMICAL COMPANY
10 Finderne Avenue
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-0500

EXAMINER

PATTERSON, MARC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

th

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/053,497	Applicant(s) DROGOU ET AL.	
	Examiner Marc A Patterson	Art Unit 1772	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: none.
- Claim(s) objected to: none.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 21-32.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: See attached.

HR

ADVISORY ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed February 1, 2005 have been fully considered but have not been found to be persuasive.

1. Applicant argues, on page 5 of the remarks dated February 1, 2005, that Yang discloses reactive hot melt polyurethane adhesives, and therefore does not disclose a hot melt adhesive that can be repeatedly heated from its solid state and flowed to a liquid form; the adhesive disclosed by Yang, Applicant argues, is an adhesive that goes through an irreversible chemical reaction once dispensed in the presence of ambient moisture, and is not encompassed by the claimed invention.

However, the claimed invention, which is only directed to a hot melt adhesive having the claimed components, does not exclude a hot melt adhesive that is 'reactive.' It is not clear furthermore, that the specification excludes a 'reactive' hot melt adhesive.

Applicant also argues on page 5 that Milks fails to cure the defect of Yang because Milks also does not disclose a hot melt adhesive that is not reactive.

However, as stated above, the claimed invention, which is only directed to a hot melt adhesive having the claimed components, does not exclude a hot melt adhesive that is 'reactive.' It is not clear furthermore, that the specification excludes a 'reactive' hot melt adhesive.

Applicant also argues on page 6 that Dupont fails to cure the defect of Yang because Dupont also does not disclose a hot melt adhesive that is not reactive.

However, as stated above, the claimed invention, which is only directed to a hot melt adhesive having the claimed components, does not exclude a hot melt adhesive that is 'reactive.' It is not clear furthermore, that the specification excludes a 'reactive' hot melt adhesive.

Applicant also argues on page 6 that Howells fails to cure the defect of Yang because Howells also does not disclose a hot melt adhesive that is not reactive.

However, as stated above, the claimed invention, which is only directed to a hot melt adhesive having the claimed components, does not exclude a hot melt adhesive that is 'reactive.' It is not clear furthermore, that the specification excludes a 'reactive' hot melt adhesive.

Applicant also argues on page 6 that Gruber et al fail to cure the defect of Yang because Gruber et al also do not disclose a hot melt adhesive that is not reactive.

However, as stated above, the claimed invention, which is only directed to a hot melt adhesive having the claimed components, does not exclude a hot melt adhesive that is 'reactive.' It is not clear furthermore, that the specification excludes a 'reactive' hot melt adhesive.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc A Patterson whose telephone number is 571-272-1497.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marc Patterson

Marc A. Patterson, PhD.
Examiner
Art Unit 1772


HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1772 2/24/05